

Two-hole bound states in modified t - J model

M.Yu. Kuchiev^a and O. P. Sushkov^b

School of Physics, The University of New South Wales Sydney 2052, Australia

Abstract

We consider modified $t - J$ model with minimum of single-hole dispersion at the points $(0, \pm\pi)$, $(\pm\pi, 0)$. It is shown that two holes on antiferromagnetic background produce a bound state which properties strongly differs from the states known in the unmodified $t - J$ model. The bound state is d-wave, it has four nodes on the face of the magnetic Brillouin zone. However, in the coordinate representation it looks like as usual s-wave.

PACS: 74.20.-z, 75.30.Ds, 75.50.Ee

It is widely believed that essential physics of high- T_c Cooper Oxide superconductors is described by $t - J$ model on two dimensional square lattice. It is well known that at half-filling (one hole per site) this model is equivalent to the Heisenberg antiferromagnetic insulator with the long-range antiferromagnetic order in the ground state. However any finite doping by holes destroys the long-range order (see e.g. Refs. [1–5]). The problem of two-hole bound state is closely related to the problem of superconducting pairing. However it is substantially simpler because no destruction of the antiferromagnetic order is to be considered, the two holes can not destroy the well defined antiferromagnetic background.

Single hole (single hole above half-filling) properties in the t - J model are by now well established. A hole is an object with complex structure due to virtual admixture of spin excitations. The bottom of the hole band is at the momenta $\mathbf{k} = (\pm\pi/2, \pm\pi/2)$. The dispersion is almost degenerate along the face of the magnetic Brillouin zone $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{2}(\cos k_x + \cos k_y) = 0$ (see e.g. Refs. [6–15]). So the dispersion at the minima $\mathbf{k} = (\pm\pi/2, \pm\pi/2)$ is very anisotropic: the effective mass is very large along the face of magnetic Brillouin zone, in contrast it is equal to approximately two electron masses in the perpendicular direction. The mass ratio is about 6 [12,15]. A hole can be characterized by the z-projection of spin $S_z = \pm\frac{1}{2}$, where z is a direction of the staggered magnetization.

In the $t - J$ model two holes with opposite S_z produce an infinite set of bound states. Classification of these states as well as calculation of their binding energies is given in our work [16]. The interesting peculiarity of these states is an unusual relation between the wave function in $\mathbf{k}$ -representation, parity, and the wave function in coordinate representation. For example the state which is usually called d-wave possesses four nodes on the face of magnetic Brillouin zone and has positive parity, but in the coordinate representation it looks like a p-wave. This peculiarity is due to the existence of the antiferromagnetic background. For $t/J \leq 2 - 3$ there are also the short-range bound states whose size is close to a lattice spacing. They belong to d- and p-wave symmetry according to conventional classification by the number of nodes on the face of magnetic Brillouin zone. They are known as well from computer simulations [17–21] and from variational calculations [22]. Usually it is convenient to consider these latter states in the momentum representation. That is why the unusual properties of the wave function in the momentum and coordinate representations are not so interesting for these deep states.

The pure $t - J$ model gives a Fermi surface with small hole pockets centred at $(\pm\pi/2, \pm\pi/2)$. The mentioned above properties of two-hole bound states are essentially based on the fact that minima of single-hole dispersion are at these points. However recent experimental data on angle-resolved photoemission (see e.g. Refs. [23,24]) demonstrate the existence of large Fermi surface with minima at the points $(\pm\pi, 0)$, $(0, \pm\pi)$. Let us incorporate these data into the $t - J$ model. With this purpose let us include into the Hamiltonian a small hopping amplitude along the plaquette diagonals (compare with Ref. [25]). So let us consider $t - t' - J$ model. We will consider very small values of diagonal hopping ($t' \leq 0.1t$), therefore all properties of hole-hole and hole spin-wave interactions remain practically unchanged in comparison with pure $t - J$ model. However this small t' is enough to shift minima of single-hole dispersion from $(\pm\pi/2, \pm\pi/2)$ to $(\pm\pi, 0)$, $(0, \pm\pi)$, and we will see that it drastically changes the properties of two-hole bound states. In the modified model there is only one exponentially shallow bound state of d-wave symmetry having four nodes on the face of the Brillouin zone. In the coordinate representation the wave-function of this state possesses no nodes which makes it look like s-wave.

In $t - J$ model for $t \leq 5$ the hole dispersion can be well approximated by the following analytical expression [14,26] (we set below $J = 1$)

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = -\sqrt{\Delta^2/4 + 4t^2(1+y) - 4t^2(x+y)\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2} + \frac{1}{4}\beta_2(\cos k_x - \cos k_y)^2, \quad (1)$$

where $\Delta \approx 1.33$, $x \approx 0.56$, $y \approx 0.14$. The parameters Δ, x, y are some combinations of the

ground state spin correlators [14]. The β_2 term gives the dispersion along the face of the Brillouin zone. It is rather small and according to Refs. [12,15] can be estimated as $\beta_2 \sim 0.1t$ at $\Delta/4 \leq t \leq 5$. The minima of the dispersion (1) are at the points $(\pm\pi/2, \pm\pi/2)$, and the mass ratio for different directions at these points is about 6.

In $t - t' - J$ model we have to add to the dispersion (1) the diagonal hopping term $4t'_{eff} \cos k_x \cos k_y$. The effective hopping parameter t'_{eff} differs from the bare one due to the dressing of the hole by spin-wave excitations. For $t' \ll t$ and $\Delta/4 \leq t \leq 5$ one gets the estimation $t'_{eff} \sim 0.5t'$. The correction to dispersion can be represented as $4t'_{eff} \cos k_x \cos k_y = 4t'_{eff}[\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2 - \frac{1}{4}(\cos k_x - \cos k_y)^2]$. The $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2$ term can be neglected in comparison with that in Eq.(1), and the second term gives the renormalization of dispersion along the face of zone: $\beta_2 \rightarrow \beta_2 - 4t'_{eff}$. So the only difference of the modified $t - J$ model from the pure one is a different value of β_2 . Therefore we can consider β_2 as independent parameter instead of t' . For positive β_2 the dispersion minima are at $(\pm\pi/2, \pm\pi/2)$, while for negative β_2 the dispersion minima are at the points $(\pm\pi, 0), (0, \pm\pi)$.

The state of two holes with zero total momentum and zero projection of spin is of the form: $|2h\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} g_{\mathbf{k}} h_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^\dagger h_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^\dagger |0\rangle$. Here $|0\rangle$ is a wave function of the quantum antiferromagnet (ground state of Heisenberg model), $h_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger$ is a creation operator of a dressed hole with dispersion (1) and $\sigma = \pm\frac{1}{2}$. To avoid misunderstanding note that a number of magnons in a dressed hole is not limited. Very roughly at $t/J = 3$ the weight of the bare hole in $h_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger$ is about 25%, the weight of configurations “bare hole + 1 magnon” is $\sim 50\%$, and of configurations “bare hole + 2 or more magnons” is $\sim 25\%$. The wave-function $g_{\mathbf{k}}$ satisfies the Bethe-Salpeter equation which is convenient to write for $\chi_{\mathbf{k}} = (E - 2\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}})g_{\mathbf{k}}$.

$$\chi_{\mathbf{k}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} \frac{\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} \chi_{\mathbf{k}'}}{E - 2\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}}. \quad (2)$$

Summation over $\mathbf{k}'$ is restricted inside the magnetic Brillouin zone ($\gamma_{\mathbf{k}'} \geq 0$). The kernel $\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}$ was derived in the work [16]. It is the sum of the single spin-wave exchange contribution and the “contact” part: $\Gamma = \Gamma_{sw} + \Gamma_{contact}$. The single spin-wave exchange part is of the form

$$\Gamma_{sw} = -16f^2 \frac{(\gamma_{-\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{q}} + \gamma_{\mathbf{k}'} v_{\mathbf{q}})(\gamma_{-\mathbf{k}'} u_{\mathbf{q}} + \gamma_{\mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{q}})}{E - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \omega_{\mathbf{q}}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k}' + \mathbf{k}$ is the momentum of virtual spin-wave, $\omega_{\mathbf{q}} = 2\sqrt{1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{q}}^2}$ is the frequency of this wave, $u_{\mathbf{q}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\omega_{\mathbf{q}}} + \frac{1}{2}}$ and $v_{\mathbf{q}} = -\text{sign}(\gamma_{\mathbf{q}})\sqrt{\frac{1}{\omega_{\mathbf{q}}} - \frac{1}{2}}$ are the parameters of the Bogoliubov transformation diagonalizing spin-wave Hamiltonian. Hole spin-wave coupling constant f is a function of t . It was calculated in the work [26]. The effective interaction (3) is given by the

second order of perturbation theory in quasihole-spin-wave interaction. Let us stress that even for $t > J$ the quasihole-spin-wave interaction has the same form as for $t \ll J$ (*i.e.* as for bare hole operators) with an added renormalization factor which is of the order J/t for $t \gg J$. This remarkable property of the t - J model is due to the absence of the single-loop correction to the hole-spin-wave vertex. It was first stated implicitly in the work [9]. In Refs. [12,13,26] it was explicitly demonstrated that the vertex corrections with different kinematic structure are of the order of few percent at $t/J \approx 3$. There is also a weak q -dependence of the coupling constant f . The value of f which we use in the present work was calculated in the Ref. [26] in the long wave length limit: $q = 0$. At $q \sim \pi$, the factor f is 17–20 % bigger than at $q = 0$, see the discussion between Eqs. (13) and (14) of Ref. [16]. This $\mathbf{q}$ -dependence does not influence the qualitative results of the present work. However it could be important for some quantitative results, see conclusion.

For the states under consideration the energy E in the denominator (3) is negligible because $|E| \ll \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + \omega_{\mathbf{q}}$. So we can set in (3) $E = 0$. Then Eq.(2) is reduced to the Schroedinger equation. The contact hole-hole interaction is of the form [22,16]: $\Gamma_{contact} \approx 8A\gamma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'}$. The vertices Γ_{sw} and $\Gamma_{contact}$ have been derived for pure $t - J$ model. Here we consider $t - t' - J$ model. However $t' \sim 0.1t \ll t$ and therefore the corrections are small. Actually they are very small $\sim (t'/t)^2$ because the interactions are due to the spin-flip processes but diagonal hopping does not result in the spin-flip. So the interactions Γ_{sw} and $\Gamma_{contact}$ derived for the pure $t - J$ model are valid for modified model as well.

For small t the parameter A in $\Gamma_{contact}$ approaches the value -0.25, which gives the well known hole-hole attraction induced by the reduction of the number of missing antiferromagnetic links in the problem. However for realistic superconductors $t \approx 3$ (see e.g.Refs. [27,28]). In this region of t the parameter A vanishes due to the hopping contribution [22]. So this mechanism of attraction is switched off. In contrast the spin-wave exchange mechanism (3) is negligible for small t where $f \propto t$, and it is the most important at large t where f approaches a t independent constant. We are interested mainly in “physical” values of t : $t \approx 3$. Therefore in the present work we neglect contact interaction ($A = 0$) and consider only the spin-wave exchange (3).

Let us concentrate here on the lowest waves of positive parity: d-wave and g-wave. The symmetries of corresponding wave functions are shown in Fig.1. It was demonstrated in the Ref. [16] that in the pure $t - J$ model (positive β_2) there is an infinite set of bound states in each of these waves, and binding energies of the states increase with decrease of β_2 . Therefore consider here first the case $\beta_2 = 0$. We found no analytical solution for this case but numerical

integration of the Eq.(2) is straightforward. The binding energies of four lowest bound states of d- and g-wave symmetry at $t = 3$, $f = 1.79$, $\beta_2 = 0$ are presented in Table 1. In the same Table we present the values of the radii of bound states in coordinate representation $r_{rms} = \sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle}$, where $\langle r^2 \rangle = \int r^2 \psi^2(\mathbf{r}) d^2r = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |\frac{\partial g_{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathbf{k}}|^2$. From Table 1 we see that at $\beta_2 = 0$ the short-range d-wave bound state ($r = 1.67$) exists at $t = 3$. Recall that in the pure $t - J$ model it vanishes at $t \approx 2 - 3$ [17–22].

The negative value of β_2 changes the situation drastically. At $\beta_2 \leq \beta_g^{crit}$ the g-wave bound state disappears. The critical value is very small. For $t = 3$, $f = 1.79$ it is $\beta_g^{crit} = -0.02$. In the d-wave at $\beta_2 \leq \beta_d^{crit}$ only one shallow bound state survives. For $t = 3$, $f = 1.79$ the d-wave critical value is $\beta_d^{crit} = -0.013$. Let us elucidate the structure of this shallow d-wave state. Bound state wave function is concentrated around the minima of hole-dispersion $(0, \pm\pi)$, $(\pm\pi, 0)$. Therefore it is convenient to shift the center of the Brillouin zone to one of these points. We transfer the usual Brillouin zone centered at $\mathbf{k} = (0, 0)$ (solid square at Fig.2) to the zone centred at $\mathbf{k}_c = (0, \pi)$ (dashed square at Fig.2). This can be done by a combination of translations by the vectors of inverse magnetic lattice $\mathbf{g} = (\pm\pi, \pm\pi)$ which are shown in Fig.2. The interaction Γ changes the sign under the translation by $\mathbf{g}$: $\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{k}'} = \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{g}} = -\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}$. This is a consequence of an existence of two magnetic sublattices. One can verify the change of sign using explicit formula (3) for Γ_{sw} . The wave function obeys similar relation $g_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{g}} = -g_{\mathbf{k}}$, because it is a solution of Eq.(2). Due to this property starting from a d-wave function in the usual Brillouin zone (four nodes on the face of zone) after translation (Fig.2) we get constant sign wave function inside the shifted zone. The wave function vanishes at the face of this zone.

For convenience let us define $\mathbf{p}$ be a deviation of a momentum from the center of shifted zone: $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_c$, and $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}'}^c = \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{k}_c, \mathbf{p}'+\mathbf{k}_c}$. In the modified model the region of long distances corresponds to small momenta $\mathbf{p}$: $r \sim p^{-1} \gg 1$. Using this fact one can easily prove that the Fourier transformation of $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}'}^c$ gives in coordinate space the short-range potential. This situation is quite different from the pure $t - J$ model where the region of long distances corresponds to small deviation of $\mathbf{k}$ from $(\pm\pi/2, \pm\pi/2)$ and therefore the same interaction gives the long-range potential [16].

We consider shallow bound state. Therefore let us solve Eq.(2) using perturbation theory. In zero approximation $\chi_{\mathbf{p}}^{(0)} = 1$. The integral in the right-hand side of equation (2) is logarithmically divergent at $\mathbf{p}' = 0$ because near this point $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}'} \approx const + \frac{1}{2}|\beta_2|\mathbf{p}'^2$. Calculating this integral with logarithmic accuracy and taking into account a consistency condition at $\mathbf{p} = 0$ one can get the well known formula [29] for exponentially shallow s-wave bound state in two

dimensions : $E \sim -|\beta_2| \cdot p_{max}^2 \cdot \exp(-4\pi\beta_2/\Gamma_{00}^c)$. However in our case $\Gamma_{00}^c = 0$ and therefore this approach should be improved. In order to do this let us first evaluate from (2) a correction containing the big logarithm: $\chi_{\mathbf{p}}^{(1)} = -\Gamma_{\mathbf{p},0}^c \cdot L$, where

$$L = \int \frac{1}{2\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}} - E} \frac{d^2\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^2} = \frac{1}{4\pi|\beta_2|} \ln\left(\frac{\beta_2 p_{max}^2}{E}\right), \quad (4)$$

$p_{max} \sim 1$. Note that $\chi_{\mathbf{p}=0}^{(1)} = 0$. Equation (2) gives

$$1 + \chi_{\mathbf{p}}^{(1)} + \chi_{\mathbf{p}}^{(2)} = \sum_{\mathbf{p}'} \frac{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}'}^c (1 + \chi_{\mathbf{p}'}^{(1)})}{E - 2\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}'}}. \quad (5)$$

Condition of consistency at small $\mathbf{p}$ (i.e. at large distances) $\chi_{\mathbf{p}=0}^{(2)} = 0$ together with Eq.(5) gives the equation for the binding energy

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= Q + R \cdot L, \\ Q &= - \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{\Gamma_{0,\mathbf{p}}^c}{2\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}}}, \\ R &= \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{\Gamma_{0,\mathbf{p}}^c \Gamma_{\mathbf{p},0}^c}{2\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Summation over $\mathbf{p}$ is restricted inside the dashed square in Fig.2. From Eq.(6) one finds

$$E = -|\beta_2| \cdot p_{max}^2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{4\pi|\beta_2|(1-Q)}{R}\right). \quad (7)$$

So we get exponentially shallow bound state. The integrals Q and R can be easily calculated. They are β_2 -dependent. For $t = 3$, $f = 1.79$ and $-0.36 \leq \beta_2 \leq 0$ their typical values are: $0.3 \leq Q \leq 0.7$, $0.2 \leq R \leq 0.4$. The values of exponent in (7) for different β_2 and $t = 3$, $f = 1.79$ are presented in Table 2. In the same Table we present $\ln(\beta_2/E)$ with E obtained by exact numerical integration of Eq.(2). The agreement of analytical formula (7) with the exact result is perfect. From comparison we find $p_{max} \approx 1.2$.

We have found exponentially shallow two-hole bound state in modified $t - J$ model having minima of the single-hole dispersion at the points $(0, \pm\pi)$, $(\pm\pi, 0)$. There is no such state in the pure $t - J$ model. Thus state behaves as s-wave in coordinate space and also as s-wave in momentum space if the rotations around the point $\mathbf{k}_c = (0, \pi)$ are considered. According to the standard classification this state possesses the symmetry of d-wave, - it has four nodes on the face of the usual magnetic Brillouin zone centered at $\mathbf{k}_c = (0, 0)$. The size of this state is large $r_{rms} = \sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}|\beta_2/E|} \gg 1$ justifying the analytical formulas used to describe it, but numerically formula (7) remains valid even if $r_{rms} \approx 2$ when the binding energy is not small.

The factor R in the exponent of (7) quadratically depends on the interaction potential Γ . This causes extremely strong dependence of the binding energy on the hole spin-wave coupling constant f : $E \sim \exp(-const/f^4)$. For numerical estimations we have used “infrared” value of the coupling constant f . However, it is evident from Eq.(6) that the main contribution comes from large $\mathbf{p}$, where f is by 17–20% bigger. So numerically we have substantially underestimated the binding energy, and account of $\mathbf{q}$ dependence of running coupling constant f requires further calculations.

The implication of the found bound state for superconducting pairing will be considered elsewhere. However we have to note here that starting from the spin-wave exchange in modified $t - J$ model we get the effective short-range attraction. This supports the scenario suggested in the recent work [25] where a short range attraction was introduced by hands.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are very grateful to G.A.Sawatzky, V.V.Flambaum, and D.I.Khomskii for stimulating discussions. Part of this work has been done during Workshop on High- T_c Superconductivity organized by Australian National Centre for Theoretical Physics at Australian National University. We are very grateful to the organizers of Workshop.

REFERENCES

- ^a Also at the A.F.Ioffe Physical-Technical Institute, 194021 St. Petersburg, Russia
- ^b Also at the Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia
- [1] B.Shraiman and E.Siggia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1564 (1989).
 - [2] A.Singh and Z.Tesanovic, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 614 (1990).
 - [3] R.Eder, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 10706 (1991).
 - [4] J.Igarashi and P.Fulde, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 10419 (1992).
 - [5] O.P.Sushkov and V.V.Flambaum, Physica C **206**, 269 (1993).
 - [6] S. A. Trugman, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 1597 (1988).
 - [7] S. Schmitt-Rink, C. M. Varma, and A. E. Ruckenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2793 (1988).
 - [8] B. Shraiman and E. Siggia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 467 (1988).
 - [9] C. L. Kane, P. A. Lee, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 6880 (1989).
 - [10] J. Bonca, P. Prelovsek, and I. Sega, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 7074 (1989).
 - [11] E. Dagotto, R. Joynt, S. Bacci, and E. Cagliano, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 9049 (1990).
 - [12] G. Martinez and P. Horsch, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 317 (1991).
 - [13] Z. Liu and E. Manousakis, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 2425 (1992).
 - [14] O. P. Sushkov, Solid State Communications **83**, 303 (1992).
 - [15] T.Giamarchi and C.Lhuillier, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 2775 (1993).
 - [16] M.Yu.Kuchiev and O.P.Sushkov, Physica C **218**, 197 (1993).
 - [17] R. Eder, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 319 (1992).
 - [18] M. Boninsegni and E. Manousakis, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 11897 (1993).
 - [19] D. Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 3368 (1993).
 - [20] A. V. Sherman, Physica C **211**, 329 (1993).
 - [21] D. Poilblanc, J. Riera, and E. Dagotto, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 12318 (1994).
 - [22] A.L.Chernyshev, A.V.Dotsenko, and O.P.Sushkov, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 6197 (1994).
 - [23] D. S. Dessau et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2781 (1993).
 - [24] D. S. Dessau, Z.-X. Shen, and D.M.Marshall, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4278 (1993).
 - [25] E. Dagotto, A. Nazarenko, and A. Moreo, Phys. Rev. Lett., to be published.
 - [26] O. P. Sushkov, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 1250 (1994).
 - [27] H. Eskes, G. A. Sawatzky, and L. F. Feiner, Physica C **160**, 424 (1989).
 - [28] V. I. Belinicher and A. L. Chernyshev, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 390 (1993).
 - [29] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, Quantum Mechanics. Nonrelativistic Theory (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1965), p. 156.

TABLES

TABLE I. Binding energies (in units of J) and radii of the four lowest bound states in d- and g-wave at $\beta_2 = 0$, $t = 3$, $f = 1.79$.

	n	1	2	3	4
d-wave	-E	0.106	$0.17 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$0.70 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$0.39 \cdot 10^{-2}$
	r_{rms}	1.67	5.2	7.8	10
g-wave	-E	$0.33 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$0.10 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$0.51 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$0.31 \cdot 10^{-2}$
	r_{rms}	4.1	6.8	9.3	12

TABLE II. Comparison of numerical and analytical calculations for different β_2 ($t = 3$, $f = 1.79$): The value of $\ln(\beta_2/E)$ with E obtained by numerical integration of the Schroedinger equation, and the value of exponent in equation (7).

β_2	-0.1	-0.2	-0.3
$\ln(\beta_2/E)$	1.0	4.5	10.3
$\frac{4\pi \beta_2 (1-Q)}{R}$	1.3	4.3	9.9

FIGURE CAPTIONS

FIG. 1. Symmetry of the bound state wave function for (a) d-wave and (b) g-wave.

FIG. 2. Transition from the usual Brillouin zone $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} \geq 0$ (solid square) to the zone centred at $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{c}} = (0, \pi)$ (dashed square).